<center>REMARKS/ARGUMENTS</center>

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application; reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

1. Claims 2 and 5 were rejected as indefinite; the Examiner noted z_p and z_r were not defined in the claims and questioned superscript t plus K= RLR^t due to page 31 omission of the superscript.

<u>Claims 2 and 5</u>: The claims have been amended to include the z_p and z_r definitions. The supescipt t is standard notation for transpose. K = RLR^t is on page 29, line 8; the special case of N = 4 makes R symmetric, so R^t = R as noted on page 31, line 6.

2. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6 were rejected as anticipated by Fimoff. The Examiner cited col.10, ln.34-38, col. 11, ln.13-23, col.16, ln.32-41, col.17, ln.10-67, and Fig.6 for the claimed 1-D de-interlacing inverse DCT.

<u>Claims 1, 3-4, and 6</u>: The base claims 1 and 4 have been amended to make clear that the de-interlacing IDCT applies just to the NxN block; whereas, cited portions of Fimoff (e.g., col.17, ln.23-27) use a stack of three DCT blocks. For example, Fimoff col.14, ln.61 has QL as an 8x48 matrix; whereas, for N = 8, the claims have 4x4 matrices T^t and QT^tK^t for the even and odd parts, respectively, of the input. Consequently, Fimoff does not suggest the claims.

3. Claims 2 and 5 were rejected as unpatentable over Fimoff

<u>Claims 2 and 5</u>: Applicant relies upon the patentability of the base claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carlton H. Hoel/

Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365